



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/555,408	11/01/2005	Ahmed El-Sayed Ahmed	2847-72452-01	9403
24197 7590 05/12/2011 KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP 121 SW SALMON STREET SUITE 1600 PORTLAND, OR 97204				
EXAMINER KANAAN, SIMON P				
ART UNIT 2432		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 05/12/2011		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tanya.harding@klarquist.com
docketing@klarquist.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/555,408

Applicant(s)

AHMED ET AL.

Examiner

SIMON KANAAN

Art Unit

2432

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-12, 14 and 19-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-12, 14 and 19-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/30/2011 has been entered.
2. Applicant's arguments/ amendments with respect to pending claims 1-5, 7-12, 14, and 19-31 filed 9/26/2010, have been fully considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection necessitated by the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
9. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 19-20, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per Claims 1-8, 19-20, and 24-26, recite the elements "interception unit, behavior analysis unit and comparison analysis unit" which is a means (or step) plus function limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. However, the written description fails to clearly link or associate the disclosed structure, material, or acts to the claimed function such that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function.

Applicant is required to:

- (a) Amend the claim so that the claim limitation will no longer be a means (or step) plus function limitation under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph; or
- (b) Amend the written description of the specification such that it clearly links or associates the corresponding structure, material, or acts to the claimed function without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)); or
- (c) State on the record where the corresponding structure, material, or acts are set forth in the written description of the specification that perform the claimed function. For more information, see 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2181.

For a computer-implemented means-plus-function claim limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, the corresponding structure is required to be more than simply a general purpose computer or microprocessor. The corresponding structure for a computer-implemented function must include the algorithm as well as the general purpose computer or microprocessor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 9-12, 19, 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Brown et al. (U S Patent Number 5,557,686) in view of Sasaki et al. (Japanese App No: 07-303209, "English translation sent with office action") hereinafter referred to as Sasaki and Matchet (US Patent No: 5,229,764) hereinafter referred to as Matchet.

As per claims 1, 25 and 26, Brown discloses: a behavioral biometrics based user verification system for use with an input device, said system comprising a data interception unit configured to intercept inputs from a user that are directed to an application - Brown, column 2 lines 15-19, collecting samples containing typing characteristics of an authorized user based on key press times and key release times is a behavioral biometrics based system which intercepts data from a user, data is collected and then user is asked to enter data, an application is running which asks the user for input hence the data is directed towards an application,

a behavior analysis unit operatively coupled to said data interception unit - Brown, column 2, lines 20-22, vectors constructed for purifying the samples are behavioral analysis units since they contain behavioral data,

and a behavior comparison unit operatively coupled to said interception unit, wherein said system translates behavioral biometrics information into representative data. - Brown, column 2, lines 28-29, the neural network trained to output whether an input is from an authorized user is representative data of biometric information,

stores and compares different results, and outputs a user identity result associated with user authorization of the user. - Brown, column 2, lines 30-32 and 38-38, the user typing the previously determined keystroke sequence into the neural network then having the neural

network determine whether the user is authorized, is storing and comparing the different results and outputting the user identity result.

But fails to disclose the input device is a mouse, and data interception is directed towards an application other than a user authentication application and wherein the data interception unit is configured to passively collect at least one mouse movement data, mouse point and click data, and mouse drag and drop data generated in response to usage of the mouse in providing input to the application other than the user authentication application;

However, Sasaki discloses the input device is a mouse, and data interception is directed towards an application other than a user authentication application and wherein the data interception unit is configured to passively collect at least one mouse movement data, mouse point and click data, and mouse drag and drop data generated in response to usage of the mouse in providing input to the application other than the user authentication application; - Sasaki, [0008] and [0019], teaches that it is desirable to repeat several times of operation is gathering a plurality of samples per mouse click and [0013], teaches detecting the habits of the individual is to detect the individual's actions without his/her awareness

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the passively collecting mouse movement data method of Sasaki with the behavioral biometric based system of Brown because having a continuous authentication method makes theft more difficult and less likely since it continuously checks up on registered user. - Matchett, column 2, lines 59-63, column 3 lines 2-3.

As per claim 2, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the user verification system of claim 1, wherein said system is suitably configured for real-time monitoring - Brown, column 13 lines 52-55, system notifying a system operator that user has not passed keystroke is real-time monitoring

As per claim 24, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the behavior analysis unit is configured to establish a user signature based on a plurality of sessions in an enrollment mode. -Brown, column 2, lines 12-25, multiple user samples are used in authentication process.

As per claim 9, Brown discloses a method of characterizing a user comprising the steps of: receiving data associated at a user application; passively intercepting at least a portion of the received data and forwarding the intercepted data to a behavioral processing unit; processing the intercepted portion so as to develop a signature for a user. - Brown, column 2 lines 15-19, a keyboard is a motion-based input device which is used to collect data, an application is running which asks the user for input hence the data is directed towards an application, AND Brown column 2 lines 20-22, vectors constructed for purifying the samples are behavioral analysis units since they contain behavioral data and column 2 lines 28-29, the neural network trained to output whether an input is from an authorized user is representative data of biometric information, AND Brown column 2 lines 30-32 and 38-38, the user typing the previously determined keystroke sequence into the neural network then having the neural network determine whether the user is authorized is a model of users signature.

But fails to disclose the input device is a mouse, and data interception is directed towards an application other than a user authentication application and wherein the data interception unit is configured to passively collect at least one mouse movement data, mouse point and click data, and mouse drag and drop data generated in response to usage of the mouse in providing input to the application other than the user authentication application;

However, Sasaki discloses the input device is a mouse, and data interception is directed towards an application other than a user authentication application and wherein the data interception unit is configured to passively collect at least one mouse movement data, mouse point and click data, and mouse drag and drop data generated in response to usage of the mouse in providing input to the application other than the user authentication application; - Sasaki, [0008] and [0019], teaches that it is desirable to repeat several times of operation is gathering a plurality of samples per mouse click and [0013], teaches detecting the habits of the individual is to detect the individual's actions without his/her awareness

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the passively collecting mouse movement data method of Sasaki with the behavioral biometric based system of Brown because having a continuous authentication method makes theft more difficult and less likely since it continuously checks up on registered user. - Matchett, column 2, lines 59-63, column 3 lines 2-3.

As per claim 10, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the method of claim 9, further comprising comparing said signature with a signature of an authorized user - Brown, column 2 lines 30-32 and 38-38, the user typing the previously determined

keystroke sequence into the neural network then having the neural network determine whether the user is authorized is a model of users signature.

As per claim 11, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the method of claim 10, further comprising filtering said data after processing and before developing the signature to reduce noise - Brown, column 4 lines 30-35, purifying users input files is filtering the processed data before modeling and reduces noise.

As per claim 12, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the method of any one of claims 11, further comprising collecting and processing and developing the signature in real-time - Brown, column 14 lines 7-18, continuously updating the users profile with new samples is a method which collects, processes and models data in real-time, modeling the data is the user signature.

As per claim 19, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the behavior comparison unit is configured to store user identities for a plurality of potential users, and the user identity result identifies the user from among the plurality of potential users. - Brown, column 2, lines 16 and 17, plurality of users are authorized for system, i.e. authentication information is stored for multiple users of the system

5. Claim 4-5, 7-8, 14, 20-23, and 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Brown in view of Sasaki, Matchet and further in view of Usui (Japanese

Application No: 2002222051, "English translation sent with office action") hereinafter referred to as Usui.

As per claim 5, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the limitations of claim 4,

But does not disclose wherein said data interception unit is further configured to characterize movement based on at least one of average speed, average traveled distance, and direction of movement

However, Usui teaches wherein said data interception unit is further configured to characterize movement based on at least one of average speed, average traveled distance, and direction of movement - Usui's Text of Basic Abstract

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of the ordinary skill in the art to include Usui's teaching with the method Brown in order to provide users with the ability to monitor their micromovement. This is combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

As per claim 7, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the limitations of claim 1,

But does not teach wherein said data interception unit is further configured to identify action from a mouse as one of drag and drop, point and click, mouse movement, and silence, such that in use, said system receives data from a mouse

However, Usui teaches wherein said data interception unit is further configured to characterize movement based on at least one of average speed, average traveled distance, and direction of movement - Usui's Text of Basic Abstract

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of the ordinary skill in the art to include Usui's teaching with the method Brown in order to provide users with the ability to monitor their micromovement. This is combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

As per claim 8, Brown in view of Sasaki and further in view of Usui discloses the limitation in claim 7, wherein said data interception unit is further configured to characterize movement based on at least one of average speed, average traveled distance, and direction of movement. - Usui's Text of Basic Abstract

As per claims 20, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the system of claim 1,

But does not teach wherein the behavior comparison unit is configured to produce the user identity result based on mouse movement speed compared to traveled distance, average speed per direction of movement, a distribution of movement directions, average speed with respect to action type, a distribution of actions, a distribution of traveled distance, and a distribution of movement elapsed time

However, Usui teaches wherein the behavior comparison unit is configured to produce the user identity result based on mouse movement speed compared to traveled distance, average speed per direction of movement, a distribution of movement directions, average speed with respect to action type, a distribution of actions, a distribution of traveled distance, and a distribution of movement elapsed time. -Usui's Text of Basic Abstract

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of the ordinary skill in the art to include Usui's teaching with the method Brown in order to provide users with the ability to monitor their micromovement. This is combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

As per claim 4 and 22, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the limitations of claim 1 and 9 respectively,

But does not teach wherein said data interception unit is configured to identify data based on mouse movement between first and second locations, wherein movement between the first and second locations is not associated with a mouse click

However Usui teaches wherein said data interception unit is configured to identify data based on mouse movement between first and second locations, wherein movement between the first and second locations is not associated with a mouse click -Usui's Text of Basic Abstract

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of the ordinary skill in the art to include Usui's teaching with the method Brown in order to provide users with the ability to monitor their micromovement. This is combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

As per claims 14, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the system of claim 1,

But does not disclose wherein the limitations of claim 9, wherein said collecting data further comprises characterizing movement based on at least one of average speed, average traveled distance, and direction of movement

However, Usui teaches wherein the limitations of claim 9, wherein said collecting data further comprises characterizing movement based on at least one of average speed, average traveled distance, and direction of movement -Usui's Text of Basic Abstract

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of the ordinary skill in the art to include Usui's teaching with the method Brown in order to provide users with the ability to monitor their micromovement. This is combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

As per claim 21 Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the method of claim 9,

But does not teach wherein the signature for the user is developed based on movement speed compared to traveled distance, average speed per direction of movement, distribution of movement directions, average speed with respect to action type, a distribution of actions, a distribution of traveled distance, and a distribution of movement elapsed time.

However Usui teaches wherein the signature for the user is developed based on movement speed compared to traveled distance, average speed per direction of movement, distribution of movement directions, average speed with respect to action type, a distribution of actions, a distribution of traveled distance, and a distribution of movement elapsed time. -Usui's Text of Basic Abstract

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of the ordinary skill in the art to include Usui's teaching with the method Brown in order to provide users with the ability to monitor their micromovement. This is combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

As per claim 23, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the method of claim 9,

But does not disclose wherein the behavioral biometric information from the mouse is obtained in a background process

However Usui teaches wherein the behavioral biometric information from the mouse is obtained in a background process - Usui's Text of Basic Abstract

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of the ordinary skill in the art to include Usui's teaching with the method Brown in order to provide users with the ability to monitor their micromovement. This is combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

As per claim 28, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the signature for the user is developed - Brown, column 2 lines 20-22, vectors constructed for purifying the samples are behavioral analysis units since they contain behavioral data

But does not teach based on a distribution of traveled distances

However, Usui teaches based on a distribution of traveled distances- Usui's Text of Basic Abstract

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of the ordinary skill in the art to include Usui's teaching with the method Brown in order to provide users with the ability to monitor their micromovement. This is combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results.

6. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Brown in view of Sasaki, Matchet and further in view of Mizutome et al. (US Pre-Grant Publication No: 2002/0078447) .

As per claim 27, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses system of claim 1,

But fails to disclose wherein the behavior comparison unit is configured to produce the identity result based on a histogram of mouse movement directions.

However Mizutome discloses wherein the behavior comparison unit is configured to produce the identity result based on a histogram of data associated with input device.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify the data collection system used for authorizing a user in Brown with the data collection system of storing the data in a histogram as taught by Mizutome because a histogram is a well known method for collecting and displaying data.

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Sasaki, Matchet and in further view of Boebert et al. (US Patent Number 5,596,718).

As per claim 3, Brown in view of Sasaki discloses: the limitations of claim 2

But fails to disclose further comprising secure communication protocols operatively couple to said data interception unit.

Boebert discloses: further comprising secure communication protocols operatively couple to said data interception unit; - Boebert, column 3 lines 26-29, an inserted trusted path between

input/output devices and work station is a secure communication protocol between the system and data interception.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the secure communication between input device and system of Boebert with the behavioral biometric based system of Brown because it would deter malicious hard ware or software from emulating and listening to the communication path between the user and system - Boebert, column 1 lines 30-35.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Simon Kanaan whose telephone number is (571)270-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the above noted Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron, can be reached at the following telephone number: (571) 272-3799.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions

Art Unit: 2432

on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/SIMON KANAAN/
Examiner, Art Unit 2432

/Benjamin E Lanier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432